DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 343 HE 019 839

AUTHOR Simmons, Howard L.; And Others
TITLE Involvement and Empowerment of Minorities and Women in the Accrediting Process: Report of a National Study.
INSTITUTION State and Regional Higher Education Center, Florida.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 94p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); *Accrediting Agencies; Administrative Policy; Career Ladders; *Consultants; *Females; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; National Surveys; *Participant Satisfaction; *Power Structure; Professional Personnel; Questionnaires; Self Evaluation (Groups)

ABSTRACT

The participation of minorities and women in the accrediting process was examined in a national study, based on the perspectives of the accrediting agencies, the member institutions, and active participants in the process. Accrediting agencies belonging to the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation provided names of colleges that conducted a self-study in a 3-year period. Survey instruments were sent to the accrediting agencies and a sample of the colleges. Women and minorities who had been identified by the institutions were also surveyed to determine their experiences in the accrediting process as well as perceived or actual empowerment derived from such participation. Findings included: better data on the participation of minorities and women in accreditation are needed; 89% of respondent colleges viewed participation in accreditation as being prestigious and as an enhancer of professional mobility, and nearly all individual participants indicated that involvement had resulted in some form of empowerment; all but three of the accrediting agency policy-making boards reported female representation, while 12 agencies reported no minority board membership. Additional findings and recommendations to accrediting agencies, colleges, and participants are provided, along with the survey questionnaires. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

INVOLVEMENT AND EMPOWERMENT OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN THE ACCREDITING PROCESS:

Report Of A National Study

ED276343

Howard L. Simmons

Louis W. Bender

Carmen L. Myers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

College of Education
Florida State Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Florida State University

HE 019 839

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INVOLVEMENT AND EMPOWERMENT

OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN THE ACCREDITING PROCESS

Howard L. Simmons

Commission on Higher Education

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

Louis W. Bender

The Florida State University

Carmen L. Myers

The Florida Department of Education

November, 1986

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This monograph is based on a national policy study concerned with the involvement of women and minorities in the accrediting process. The conceptual framework was based on the theory of empowerment since accreditation in American higher education is unique and prestigious and since participation in the accrediting process results from identification and selection policies and procedures.

Examined in the national study reported herein are aspects of participation of women and minorities from the perspective of the accrediting agencies, the member institutions, and those who have been active participants in the process. Three phases were carried out in the study. All COPA member accrediting agencies were asked to supply the names of institutions which had carried out self-study any time during the last three years. Then survey instruments were sent to the accrediting agencies and a sample of the institutions they had identified, and, finally, women and minorities who had been identified by the institutions were surveyed to determine their experiences in the accrediting process as well as perceived or actual empowerment derived from such participation.

The respondent behavior and pattern of comments suggest the subject of the study stimulated strong defensive reactions, whether of a political or ethical

nature. There was consistent strong agreement that participation in the accrediting process is perceived as empowering. Yet, few accrediting agencies have policies or practices which would utilize such empowerment as a strategy for addressing the underrepresentation of women and minorities in higher education. While many of the accrediting staffs attempt to identify and select qualified minorities and women in a non-discriminatory manner, the fact remains that those within the institutions appeared to be unfamiliar with the identification and selection process. The mystique of accreditation is perpetuated by the absence of widespread knowledge of the process, particularly within the member institutions at the lower administrative and faculty levels. Furthermore, the composition of visiting teams which usually takes into consideration balance as well as the nature of the institution being visited seems, in reality, more compliance motivated than anything else. While assurance of minorities on teams or committees visiting where populations of minorities are enrolled is logical, it might be argued that greater egalitarian purposes would be served by minority presence on accrediting visits to institutions or programs where minorities are underrepresented among the student population.

Many of the constituent institutions do involve women in the self-study and accreditation process; however, minority persons are less frequently involved. It appears to stop there, however, since little is known about how individuals were identified or selected for participation in the accrediting process at the agency level as reflected in the responses of both the institutions and the active women and minority participants. It has been said that accreditation is high in the conscious level only when an institution's cycle is up; it would appear that similar identification with accreditation in nominating women and minority members from the administration and faculty only occurs on a limited scale.

The potential of the empowerment in the accrediting process is recognized in many institutional policies, however. According to this study, individuals empowered from participating in the accrediting process can expect to benefit from consideration for professional growth, tenure and promotion, even in enhanced working relationships with administrators and faculty. Such a conclusion is as true of the specialized/professional accreditation as it is of the institutional accreditation experience.

Just as agencies have not considered or utilized the empowerment potential of participation, institutions similarly seem unaware, if not disinterested, in the potential of identifying and nominating qualified women and minorities to become active participants in the accrediting process. While it is generally agreed professional growth as well as opportunities to examine practices in other settings result from participation, little has been done at the institutional level to capitalize on this potential of accrediting.

Those who have enjoyed the empowerment benefit of participating in the accrediting process acknowledge a dual responsibility for maximizing such involvement of all qualified faculty and staff. Individuals need to take a proactive stance, learn more about accreditation and its procedures, how to be identified and selected, and then document achievements and other relevant qualifications in order to warrant nomination and participation. However, accreditation and institutional leaders need to examine their responsibility to capitalize upon the unique opportunities inherent in the accrediting process to correct the underrepresentation of minorities and women in American higher education.

In addition to those areas already highlighted, major findings in the monograph suggests that 1) accrediting agencies and institutions need to develop

better records and documentation on the participation of women and minorities; 2) women fare better than minorities in terms of participation at all levels in the accreditation process; 3) the particular level of women and minorities seems to reflect the underrepresentation of these groups on the faculties and staffs of the institutions; 4) minorities and women fare less well on the professional staffs of the regional agencies when compared with the specialized agencies; 5) minority women appear to be less well represented than minority males or Caucasian women; and 6) women are better represented in the specialized agencies especially for those agencies representing female-dominated professions.

Finally, the monograph contains recommendations on ways to improve the involvement and empowerment of minorities and women in the accreditation process. The specific recommendations have been directed to accrediting agencies, accredited institutions and programs, and individuals involved in the accrediting process. The latter includes members of governing boards, executive and professional staff, team chairpersons, consultants, and members of Commissions and Committees, as well as evaluators and other visitors.

FOREWORD

The role of accreditation in American Higher Education is unique when examining the structure and process of higher education worldwide. The concern of our forefathers to assure the central role of the states in education and the abhorrence of any potential national politicization of higher education is reflected in the structure which avoids any national ministry or direct federal control of higher education. The voluntary institutional member sponsorship of accreditation, however, results in obligations on member institutions as well as accrediting agencies to be sensitive to and carry out legitimate national social goals that might, in other nations, be established, mandated, and monitored by a national ministry.

Social goals of equity and equality of professionals within higher education, particularly minorities and women, have been enunciated at national, state, and institutional levels for several decades. Affirmative Action plans have been called for through Congressional mandates. State plans call for programs and policies to open doors at training levels and at institutional operation levels. Strangely absent, however, has been the identification of the accrediting process as a vehicle for such equity. Yet, participation in the accrediting process, as revealed in this study, is perceived as prestigious and influential.

The researchers involved in the study have been observers and participants in regional, specialized and state accreditation/evaluation processes. Dr. Howard Simmons, a Black professional, has spent over a decade working as Associate Director of the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. Dr. Carmen L. Myers, a Hispanic professional, has spent a comparable period of her professional career working in institutional evaluation and assessment from a state perspective. Dr. Bender has worked with both accrediting agencies and state agencies in institutional and program review and accreditation activities.

The implications of this study are significant for accrediting bodies, institutions, as well as minority and women professionals. Recommendations are developed for each of the three audiences. Policy-makers and institutional decision-makers will find this study cogent, constructive, and relevant.

The research and report associated with this study was sponsored by the State and Regional Higher Education Center of The Florida State University. The Center was established in 1970 with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The mission of the Center is to provide policy and action research as well as professional development services for state, regional and national agencies concerned with higher education.

State and Regional Higher
Education Center
Louis W. Bender, Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study has been possible and successfully concluded only because of the tremendous cooperation and assistance of the many key officials and other personnel in the accrediting community, as well as numerous institutional representatives who completed survey forms or responded to telephone inquiries regarding various aspects of this survey research. Every involved individual deserves our sincere appreciation for doing all that was humanly possible to provide useful and usable data, even when the data bases were inadequate to report extensively on the minority and female experience in the accrediting process.

Equally helpful were the critical reviews and advice on the refinement of the instrument received from Mr. Calvin Crawford of the College Board and former Executive Director of Middle States Association (MSA); Dr. Gwendolyn Sanders, MSA evaluator and Dean of Students, Delaware Technical and Community College; and Mrs. Dorothy P. Heindel, retired Assistant Director of MSA, who also assisted in typing the survey instrument forms. Dr. Minna Weinstein's careful reading of the manuscript was also helpful to fine tuning the report, especially in terms of the perspectives of women in higher education.

We are also grateful for the encouragement and wise counsel given us by Dr. Richard Millard of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. And we especially appreciate offers from COPA assist in the promulgation of the study's results.

And, of course, none of this would have been possible or committed to paper had it not been for the care and patience as well as the typing, word processing and editing skills of Mrs. Betty Bender, who alone typed the original manuscript; Ms. Karen Moseley, who processed thousands of words and mastered a new software program for the production of the tables; Mr. James Earle, for his patience and infinite knowledge of the computer and its application to the production of the graphics; Ms. Alice Schell, whose superior editing skills were invaluable; and Ms. Denise Whitcomb, who assisted with the typing.

Finally, we wish to thank the Tallahassee Community College for its generosity in facilitating the publication of this report and President James Hinson and his staff members, Keith Roberts and Richard Street, who established the highest priority in having the monograph printed.

Table of Contents

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
Foreword	v
Acknowledgements	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptual Framework	5
Conduct of Study	6
Limitations of Study	11
II. FINDINGS: DATA ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION	13
Response Pattern	13
Institutional Responses	13
Participant Responses	15
Empowerment	19
The Accrediting Agencies	22
The Institutions	47
The Participants	54
III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS	59
Findings	59
Recomendations	65
APPENDIX A: Accrediting Agency Survey	73
APPENDIX B: Institution Survey	77
REFERENCES	81

I. INTRODUCTION

This report, the result of almost two years of study and analysis, documents for the first time the overall experience of minorities and women in the accrediting process, a uniquely American phenomenon. And while the field of accreditation has sparked renewed interest on the part of writers and researchers in recent years, there have been few attempts to document, statistically or otherwise, the involvement of minorities and women as underrepresented groups in the accreditation process. The most significant effort (Silvers, 1982) was embodied in a dissertation designed to analyze critically the function of evaluation teams in the regional accreditation of senior colleges and universities. In that study, there was an assessment of the level of gender and racial/ethnic participation in the accrediting process. Another study (Kells, 1984) included particular reference to the gains made by women in the accrediting process in the Middle States region.

Results from this study, on the other hand, have provided data not only on the profile of the regional, institutional and specialized accrediting bodies, but also have documented incidences of campus and individual involvement in self-study and evaluation, as well as how the process of accreditation is viewed as a form of empowerment for minorities and women.

Generally, the accrediting bodies and the institutions involved in the study were faithful in reporting data available to them, even though these data were spotty in some instances. Nevertheless, as this report demonstrates, there was a wealth of information provided upon which to perform analyses, make inferences, discuss implications, draw conclusions, and suggest recommendations. If nothing else, this report should definitely form the basis for future qualitative research on the involvement of minorities and women in the American system of accreditation.

In conducting a study, it was soon apparent that the accrediting community could be viewed as a microcosm of higher education, in that it reflects the demographics, policies, practices, and philosophies of those who have primary responsibilities for institutional governance, administration and teaching. Thus, in spite of federal and state Affirmative Action laws and regulations, women and minorities continue to be underrepresented in administrative positions in America's colleges and universities. Recent studies sponsored by the American Council on Education find relatively little progress in the representation of women or minorities in mid-level and senior level executive positions (Frances and Hensel, 1981) in contrast to an earlier assessment carried out by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973). The approximate 4 percent positive change is attributed to the increased number of women in the work force, greater mobility of women, and

an increase in the number of women obtaining terminal degrees. Astin (1982) documented the underrepresentation of minorities, students as well as professional staff, two decades after the civil rights movement began. Simmons (1984) has reported on problems of minority (especially Black) representation in institutional accreditation. Various special programs and initiatives have been taken by an array of national higher education associations and philanthropic organizations aimed at spurring upward professional mobility of women and minorities. Yet, there appears to be a missing thread in the fabric of higher education's social and professional equality goals.

One of the missing links in achieving the desired upward mobility of women and minorities within the profession is the absence of an active, affirmative role that might be achieved through the institutional and program accreditation process. Commitment to voluntary accreditation in lieu of a national ministry may inadvertently result in an oversight of the strategic role accreditation might play in correcting some of the historical inequities. And since the underrepresentation of minorities and women in the accrediting process is related directly to a larger social context in the United States, strongsupport for equity issues is needed at the federal and state levels. While not specifically writing about accreditation and the issue of minority and female involvement, Serow (1983) concluded that:

> [T]he most effective approach to the socialization of tolerance would be for government to insist that standards of fairness and equality are carried out in all major institutions.

Moreover, other researchers (Klein and Bogart, 1986) in studying various ways to increase sex equity at all educational levels, underscored the fact that females and males continue to have different experiences as students, faculty,

administrators, and staff at all educational levels and in all educational settings. Certainly, regional, institutional, and specialized accreditation touches nearly every college and university on a regular basis (Kells, 1984).

Evaluation teams and committees made up of qualified peer professionals visit the campus of the institution under review, carry out interviews, interact with policy and decision-makers and enjoy an aura of prestige. Individuals serving on such teams typically are perceived on their own campus as well as the host campus as authorities or experts (Young, Chambers, Kells, 1983). The question is whether qualified women and minorities are appropriately represented on such teams. A concomitant question is whether accrediting agencies and their member institutions have policies, practices, and procedures which affirmatively promote women and minorities in the accreditation process, thereby enhancing upward mobility.

The evidence would suggest accreditation and professional affirmative action have never been consciously related. Compliance criteria for recognition of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations promulgated by the U.S. Department of Education speak only of the agency or association using "..competent and knowledgeable persons, qualified by experience and training, and select such persons in accordance with non-discriminatory practices.." (1981). A review of the requirements of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the umbrella organization for institutional and professional associations, similarly pledges a guarantee rather than an affirmative statement. Several of the regional accrediting associations do urge members to identify qualified women and minorities when recommending prospective visiting team members. No effort is made, however, to determine whether such action takes place. Furthermore, it is not known what pool of prospective women and minorities does exist nor how the agencies have used that pool. A number of important research questions emerge:

1. What is the involvement level of women and minorities in the accrediting process? Is there any difference between institutional and specialized/professional accrediting agencies in such involvement?

2. What, if any, individual professional empowerment is associated with participation in the accrediting process?

3. What problems are inherent in the identification, selection, and appointment process which deter broadening participation of minorities and women in the accrediting process?

Conceptual Framework

Given the intent of policy research to influence decisions about a particular outcome, the temptation is to proceed without the encumbrance of a conceptual framework. Yet, the complexities of studying the role of accreditation in relation to the upward professional mobility of women and minorities requires a model to identify variables of importance within a recognizable perspective. Underrepresentation of women and minorities results, in part, from inaccessibility to power. Hersey & Blanchard (1983) discussed the concept of power both in organizational and individual perspectives. Theories which fit into this category operate on the assumption that when more people in an organization are "empowered," the effectiveness of the organization is enhanced (Kanter, 1979; Salancik and Pfeffer, 1974; Devadoss and Muth, 1984).

For the purpose of this study, Kanter's (1977) theoretical framework identifying strategies to obtain power or to become "empowered" in the organizational structure was used. Kanter recognizes both the formal and informal sources of "empowering" derived from activities that are (a) extraordinary, (b) visible, and (c) relevant. Thus, women and minorities who are provided visibility of their professional achievements and potential through being identified, selected,

and utilized in the accreditation process acquire degrees of professional influence. Participation on accreditation teams is viewed as prestigious and as evidence of knowledge, expertise, and "connections". Kanter contended "...Women and minorities are often found in jobs that are behind the scenes or without measurable, identifiable contributions" (Fant and Kanter, 1980 p. 23).

The power gained through social connections in the informal organization represents a second major source of becoming "empowered" (Allen and Porter, 1983; Bras, 1985; Strauss, 1973). This has been recognized in many contemporary women's initiatives through the use of sponsors or mentors who facilitate the movement of a protége through the system. As a result, accreditation provides a significant potential for empowering qualified women and minorities both within their own institution and within the profession, thereby enhancing the advancement potential for the individual.

Conduct of the Study

The basic methodology in this policy research involved a survey which was carried out through a three-phase time period. Initially, letters were written to each of the accrediting members of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) requesting published policies and procedures pertinent to their accreditation process as well as a list of the member institutions which had carried out self-study over the three-year period 1982-83 through 1984-85. The purpose of this phase was to secure policy documents which could be analyzed and were relevant to the study. In addition, a listing of member institutions that completed self-study between 1982-83 and 1984-85 would provide the population of institutions to be surveyed. Furthermore, the individual responding for the Agency became the

contact person to whom the researchers could address a subsequent survey request. Interestingly, this phase of the study not only resulted in timely response but also over ninety percent participation by all of the member agencies of COPA.

Phase II involved a mailing of a survey instrument to the COPA member accrediting agencies (both institutional and specialized/program as shown on Figure 1) as well as a similar but appropriately modified survey instrument to a sample of the 1982-85 self-study population of colleges and universities in each of the six regions in the nation (see Appendices A & B). A transmittal letter, an abstract of the purpose of the study, and the survey instrument were included in initial and subsequent follow-up mailings.

Phase III was dependent upon responses from the institutions surveyed since the questionnaire solicited names of women and minorities known to the institutional respondent as active consultants/evaluators in the accrediting process (whether institutional or specialized/program). No attempt was made to secure a list of such participants from the agencies since the researchers had been warned confidentiality policies would preclude cooperation at the agency level.

An analysis of the surveys was conducted with attention to the difference in type of accreditation (regional/institutional versus specialized/professional) and on the basis of the six regions in the country. Agency returns provided information on participation levels of policy makers, agency staff, and consultants or evaluators, as well as problems in identifying, selecting, and using minorities and women in the accrediting process. The returns from institutions provided information on self-study participation as well as institutional policies and practices relevant to the study. The participant returns provided evidences of empowerment derived from the accrediting process involvement as well as perceived barriers and

enhancers to broadening participation from the perspectives of the agencies, the institutions, and interested professionals.

The national study was quite inclusive as reflected in the sections on data analysis and discussion related to accrediting agencies, institutions, and individual participants, many of whom were minority and female respondents. The researchers were interested not only in the "What" and "Why" of the problem but also the perceived "How" at the national, agency, and institutional levels to realize the full potential of the accrediting process as a vehicle for professional mobility of minorities and women.

Figure 1

Participating Accrediting Agencies*
(Grouped By Type)

REGIONAL

1-1	(NCA)	North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
2-5	(NEA)	New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
3-6	(SACS)	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
4-7	(WAJC)	Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Community and Junior Colleges
5-27	(NEVT)	New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Vocational, Technical, Career Institutions
6-28	(MSA)	Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
7-29	(NWA)	Northwest Association of Colleges and Schools
8-32	(WASCS)	Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Senior Colleges and Universities

OTHER INSTITUTIONAL

1-2	(ATS)	Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada
2-11	(AICS)	Association of Independent Colleges and Schools
3-15	(AABS)	American Association of Bible Colleges
4-35	(NHSC)	National Home Study Council

SPECIALIZED

1-3	(NAAB)	National Architectural Accrediting Board
2-4	(ABA)	American Bar Association
3-8	(CPME)	Council on Podiatric Medical Education
4-9	(AVMA)	American Veterinary Medical Association, Division of Scientific Activities
5-10	(CCEA)	Council on Chiropractic Education, Commission on Accreditation
6-12	(FNID)	Foundation for Interior Design Education Research
7-13	(NLN)	National League for Nursing
8-14	(CORE)	Council on Rehabilitation Education
9-16	(AMALC)	American Medical Association, LCME
10-17	(ABHES)	Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools
11-18	(SAF)	Society of American Foresters
12-19	(NASM)	National Association of School of Music
13-20	(ALA)	American Library Association, Committee on Accreditation
14-21	(AACSB)	American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
15-22	(AOA)	American Osteopathic Association, Commission on Osteopathic Education
16-23	(NCATE)	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
17-24	(CEPH)	Council on Education for Public Health
18-25	(ASLHA)	Educational Standards Board of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association

*Regional, Other Institutional, Specialized Participants

Figure 1 Cont'd.

19-26 (ADA1)	American Dietetic Association, Commission on Accreditation
20-30 (ADA2)	American Dental Association, Commission on Dental Education
21-31 (ABET)	Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology
22-33 (APTA)	American Physical Therapy Association
23-34 (APA)	American Psychological Association

Limitations of the Study

Any study of this magnitude can be affected by factors tending to limit the general applicability of findings or can suggest caveats to be taken into account when conclusions and recommendations are considered. Chief among these are the following:

1. Even though there was a significantly high response rate to the surveys administered, some of the data categories had gaps because adequate records had not always been kept by agencies and higher education institutions on the gender and ethnicity/race of the participants in the evaluation and accreditation processes.

2. Incomplete responses because of inadequate records or data bases could be a factor in raising or lowering the numbers and percentages reported, though not by large margins.

3. Since the study was focused on the current profile of the accrediting community, the prior and subsequent records could have provided either a more positive or negative assessment.

4. The study was limited to those colleges, universities, and programs that had been evaluated during the 1982-85 time period, and to those consultant/evaluators who were involved in accrediting activities during this period.

II. FINDINGS: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Response Pattern

The respondent pattern and behavior are noteworthy. In Phase I, all of the member agencies of COPA responded promptly when asked to report the institutional self-study activities over the last three years. There was no need to carry out a follow-up procedure with a single organization.

When the survey instruments were sent to the same agencies, however, follow-up procedures were necessary; in fact, a third iteration telephone request was initiated in order to get as complete coverage of the accrediting agencies as possible. During the first four-week iteration, agencies produced a 20 percent response rate, institutions a 32 percent response rate. During the follow-up iteration carried out during the month of January, the agency response rose to 47 percent. The telephone follow-up was limited to the agencies and it produced 7 returns for an overall percentage of 76 percent for the COPA membership. Fortunately, all of the regional institutional accrediting bodies finally responded; three of the five national institutional accrediting bodies (predominantly proprietary

institutions) replied while 24 of the 33 specialized (program) accrediting bodies responded. At times the survey respondents made strong, somewhat defensive comments. Such reaction was demonstrated in an executive secretary's verbal threat during the telephone follow-up, "If you list this agency as uncooperative or as a nonrespondent, I intend to file a formal protest with COPA!"

The pattern of written comments was a further indicator that respondents experienced discomfort. There were profuse comments recorded on the survey returns of the agencies. In stark contrast, however, there was nearly a total absence of comments on the institution responses. In each case, however, the instruments had invited observations or reactions on the existing state of participation of women and minorities in accreditation as well as the reasons for that state. Other questions invited comment on causes of underrepresentation where existent as well as proposed solutions if, in fact, underrepresentation existed. As will be reported later, comments of the agencies were more defensive than constructive.

A comparable unanticipated outcome occurred in the institutional response pattern. A total of twenty institutions returned their survey instrument unused with accompanying letters of explanation or apology. Reasons such as the press of time, unavailability of data, or other perceived barriers to cooperation were given. The apology and justification reflected in the responses of this group are best illustrated by a letter from a major research institution with a reputation for social activism:

> Chancellor _____has asked me to respond to your request of January 1985 in which you invited the University of _____, to participate in a study concerning involvement of minorities and women in the accreditation process. I am sorry to inform you that we will be unable to participate owing to a lack of the requisite data, and insufficient staff resources to perform the research that would be necessary to accumulate such data. I am sure you will understand.

Another letter was received from a distinguished women's college:

> I regret to inform you that President _____of_____ College will be unable to participate in your study to examine participation of minorities and women in the accrediting process.
> President _____receives several requests each month to provide data for various studies and, because of the extensive demands on her time, she can only participate in a very select few.
>
> With best wishes for the success of your study.

The Participant Response

Response patterns of the survey instruments sent to the women and minorities identified as known participants by the institutions (Cf. Phase III, p.) were equally interesting. First, 22 letters mailed to the individuals identified in the institutional response were returned by the post office with the notation: "Addressee Unknown" or "No longer at this address". It was obvious that many respondents listed individuals who were in other institutions and who were mere acquaintances.

A number of questions were addressed to those who had been identified as minority and/or women participants in the accrediting process. It was agreed that their perception of the problem as the affected class would yield insights on the nature of the problem as well as suggestions for possible action.

The first question sought their perception of barriers which impede broadening of the participation of women and minorities at the institutional level. Written comments in response to the open-ended question centered on two perceived barriers best reflected in the following two comments: "Male chauvinism at the upper (beyond dean) administrative levels " and "The main barrier is history. Since it seems to be traditionally a male task, it is difficult to erase the erroneous

idea that men are more suited as evaluators than women."

The survey also asked for barriers which impede participation at the accrediting agency level. The perception of the respondents is best summarized in the written comment: "There appears to be no well defined means of getting the names of capable individuals placed in the pool of participants. A system that would permit current participants to submit names and resumes for consideration without the knowledge of the prospect would work well."

The survey then sought suggestions and advice for strategies for securing identification and appointment as a participant in the accrediting process. The advice of the respondents was directed toward women and minorities as individuals. Among the suggestions were: "Work hard, volunteer to work with the institution and get involved in professional activities. Make known your willingness to serve on evaluation teams and become actively involved at the local and state levels." Several respondents urged initiative on the part of the person, suggesting that one should make it known that he/she wants to be actively involved. Nevertheless, it was clear that the respondents expected anyone interested in such participation to be highly qualified in the first place.

Respondents also were willing to make suggestions for accrediting agencies in identifying, selecting, and involving women and minorities in the accrediting process. Several urged an ongoing policy and practice of soliciting names of qualified professionals from the affected class. Several urged a computerized information system which would not only maintain data on those recommended for service but also on the ethnic composition of professionals in the member institutions as well.

An interesting insight is provided in the comment of one respondent:

> Since these positions are time consuming, hard work and little or no pay... administrators hesitate to name busy faculty or those with other obligations (children, etc.). Encouraging interested persons to offer an application may bring people to their attention they wouldn't have chosen. Most of us contribute our services more for the good of the profession and education than anything else. By the time you have enough expertise to have a decisive influence on an accrediting committee, you're not particularly concerned about how much the administration is impressed. Those who have little expertise to offer and just want something for their resumes do not advance the educational process by serving; they are very obvious and hurt themselves and their home institutions by posturing rather than listening and evaluating.

Finally, the survey asked what affirmative action role accrediting organizations should play? It was evident that none of the respondents perceived any accrediting agencies that had deliberately excluded women and minorities. And even though the data would suggest a lack of strong commitment on the part of some of the accrediting bodies and their member institutions and programs, most respondents expressed a willingness to at least identify and select minorities in a more aggressive manner in the future. Further, some efforts have been made--although modest at times--to be aware of and include women and minorities in the accrediting process. What is missing, however, has been a realization of the empowering quality of such participation and any formal policy to take affirmative action. The number of respondents who answered the affirmative action question exceeded those for any other question. Furthermore, they were quite consistent in calling on accrediting bodies to serve as a model in contributing to the empowerment of more women and minorities. At the same time, responses consistently called for such participation to be limited only to those who were both qualified and met the highest standards. Among the suggestions were calls for agencies to make concerted efforts to involve women and minorities in the process as well as to carefully

examine the composition of evaluation teams and the pool of possible participants. Interestingly, several observed minorities should serve on visiting teams at institutions where their race may not be represented among the student population. The perception was that all parties could benefit by such a strategy.

Empowerment

The theoretical conceptual framework for this study was based on the concept of empowerment derived from participation in the accrediting process. All three respondent groups were asked to agree or disagree with the statement that such participation is viewed as prestigious and may even enhance the professional upward mobility of the participant. Only one agency, a specialized/professional accreditation agency, disagreed. As Table 1A indicates, all but 24 institutional respondents agreed, representing a 89 percent positive response; and all but one of the participants reported experiencing some form of empowerment as a result of involvement in the accrediting process. Further analysis of the data revealed that of those institutional respondents who disagreed a significant number represented the medical and and legal profession where the individual's prestige in the process no doubt had already been established.

TABLE 1A

ACCREDITATION PROCESS
VIEWED AS PRESTIGIOUS
AND ENHANCER OF PROFESSIONAL
MOBILITY OF PARTICIPANTS
(Institutional Responses-N-209)

REGIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	TOTAL
MSA	37 (95%)	2	39
NCA	41 (84%)	8	49
NEA	16 (89%)	2	18
NWA	18 (100%)	0	18
SACS	39 (83%)	8	47
WACS	34 (89%)	4	38
TOTAL	185 (89%)	24	209

In an effort to determine substantive empowerment evidence, institutions were asked to report whether participation in accrediting was formally or informally considered as a positive factor in a variety of institutional policies. Apparently, as a measure of respect for the accrediting process as an important professional activity in higher education, it was noteworthy that practically all institutional policies allow for some form of employee leave for participation on evaluation teams and other accrediting activities. Specifically, as indicated in Table 1B, 177 out of 198 respondents (89 percent) provide professional leave with pay while only 11 percent require the employee to assume the costs of the leave by foregoing pay or taking personal or vacation leave.

TABLE 1B

Leave Policies

REGION	NCA	MSA	SACS	NEA	NWA	WASC	TOTAL
Prof. Leave w/Pay	36	36	43	15	17	30	177
Prof. Leave w/o Pay	5	3	2	3	0	3	15
Personal Leave	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Vacation Leave	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
TOTALS	44	41	45	18	17	33	198

After combining institutional response (Table 1C) from all regions of the nation, 63 percent of all institutional respondents gave an affirmative response that accreditation was considered as a factor in various institutional policies related to professional growth, promotion/tenure, merit pay, or other forms of recognition/benefits.

TABLE 1C

ACCREDITATION AS A FACTOR
IN OTHER POLICIES
(Institutional Responses: N=713)

ALL REGIONS	YES	NO	TOTALS
Professional Growth	197 (98%)	5	202
Promotion/Tenure	108 (57%)	80	188
Merit Pay	58 (36%)	102	160
Recognition/Benefit	85 (52%)	78	163
TOTALS	448 (63%)	265	713

As shown above, over 97 percent of the institutional respondents saw such participation as contributing to professional growth while approximately 57 percent reported the institution would recognize such participation as part of promotion and tenure consideration, with slightly more two-year institutions reporting positively. Over one-third of the respondents indicated merit pay consideration would be positively influenced. Of those who responded negatively (64 percent) to the merit factor, it can be inferred that at least some of the institutions did not have a merit

policy since some notations to that effect were included on the survey instruments. And more than one-half of the institutions have other professional recognition or benefits for participants in the accrediting process. Overall, then, all except the merit pay factor resulted in at least a 50 percent or more positive response, a most interesting finding in view of the importance placed on research and publication in institutional personnel advancement policies and practices. Participant perceptions were also sought on various types and evidences of empowerment and have been discussed elsewhere in this study.

The Accrediting Agencies

Responses from the accrediting agencies were analyzed according to the type of accreditation as well as a composite of all accrediting agencies. Except for questions which were dependent upon the unique type of accreditation involved, there was notable consistency and agreement in the perceptions of the respondents. As observed earlier, response patterns and written comments communicated an impression that the study of participation of minorities and women in the accrediting process is discomforting, even threatening. Twenty-three of the 35 returns were completed by the Executive Director or Deputy Executive Director. Items such as number of member and candidate institutions, membership composition of the governing board (herein referred to also as policy-making board), and, with less frequency, even the pool of consultant evaluators were reported with specific numbers.

Agency Policy-Making Boards

To place the subject of this study in the proper context, if was useful to gather profile data on the actual numbers of accredited institutions and programs, as well as the membership composition of the policy-making board. To provide some basis for comparison of the ratio of board size to agency membership, Tables 2A to 2C that follow contain both sets of statistics. Ratios range from 1:7 to 1:64 with average of 1:18.

Regional agencies reported a total number of 3016 accredited institutions, other institutional agencies another 38 and specialized accrediting bodies tallied 8784 accredited or approved programs. The magnitude of these numbers is important to establish the "long arm" of accreditation and the tremendous authority and responsibility bestowed upon policy-making boards and staffs of the accrediting agencies. And since the institutional data revealed that the numbers of minorities currently being served by higher education are significant, actual involvement of these groups could be considered a form of empowerment.

Of the eight regional agencies participating, six had at least some minority representation and one (WASCJ) had at least one representative from each minority group listed in HEGIS (i.e., Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Other [e.g., Native American]). As a percentage of the full complement of board members, MSA led with 37 percent, followed by WASCJ with 35 percent, and SACS with 17 percent.

The pattern for female representation is quite different in that higher percentages were revealed: WASCJ, 41 percent; and NEA, 31 percent. All agencies had at least 16 percent female representation compared to zero percent representation of minorities for two of the agencies.

Since the data were not requested or sorted to control for sex and race at the same time, combining the female and minority categories for analysis was not possible. Combinations, in some cases, would have resulted in duplicated counts. On the other hand, it might be argued that agencies having representatives of both groups could improve their overall percentages, except in those cases where the females were also Caucasian.

Data for regional agency boards were quite consistent with that found in a recent study (AGB, 1986) of college and University governing boards, in that these boards can also be characterized as white and predominately male,

TABLE 2A

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF REGIONAL AGENCY POLICY MAKING BOARDS

AGENCY	TOTAL #	PMB TTL	W	B	H	A	O	C	TTLM
1-1	969	15	4	2	0	0	0	13	2
2-5	200	16	5	0	0	0	0	16	0
3-6	775	66	11	9	2	0	0	54	11
4-7	154	17	7	2	1	2	1	11	6
5-27	111	16	3	0	0	0	0	16	0
6-28	503	19	8	5	1	0	1	12	7
8-32	160	25	4	1	1	0	0	23	2
7-29	144	18	8	2	0	1	0	15	3
TOTAL	3016	192	50	21	5	3	2	160	31

Legend: Agency - As indicated in Figure 1
Total # - Total number of accredited institutions by Age
PMB TTL - Total number of members of Policy Making Boards
W-Women; B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian
TTLM - Total number of minorities

even after taking into account the recent gains made by women. For this study, only 16 percent were from minority groups and 26 percent were women. Moreover, of the 31 minority representatives reported, 68 percent (21 total) were Black, 16 percent Hispanic, 10 percent Asian, and 7 percent other minority. But when the percentage for each minority group was based on the total number of board members reported (N=192), the actual percentage representation decreased dramatically to 11 percent for Blacks; 3 percent for Hispanics; 2 percent for Asians; and approximately 1 percent for other minorities.

The average size of the policy-making boards for those providing usable data was 13 percent. The representation of females as given in Table 2B ranged from a high of 33 percent (ATS) to a low of 10 percent (AABC).

TABLE 2B

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF INSTITUTIONAL AGENCY POLICY MAKING BOARDS

AGENCY	TTL ACCRED	PMB TTL	W	B	H	A	O	C	TTLM
1-2	200	12	4	1	0	0	0	7	1
2-11	630	16	4	2	1	0	0	9	3
3-15	106	10	1	0	0	0	0	9	0
4-35	+65	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	1001	38	9	3	1	0	0	25	4

Legend: Agency - As indicated in Figure 1
TTL ACCRED - Total number of accredited institutions by agency
PMB TTL - Total number of members on Policy Making Boards
W-Women; B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian
TTLM - Total number of minorities

AICS reported 25 percent female participation. The other agency reported no real figures but wrote that some females were involved and the actual numbers reflected the male-dominated nature of that particular constituency. Again, the relative position for minorities was not as good, except in the case of AICS, which reported 2 Black and 1 Hispanic board members, for a total representation of 19 percent. ATS accounted for 1 Black member on its policymaking board and AABC reported having no minority representatives. Overall, all agencies in this group had 24 percent female and 11 percent minority representation on policy-making boards.

Interestingly, there was an average of 17 board members for 8784 accredited or approved programs reported by the 23 specialized accrediting bodies. The actual ratio of board members to accredited programs ranged from 2:1 (CPME) to 1:68 (ADA2), with the modal ratio being 1:12 (FNID).

With respect to female representation on policy-making boards, women were represented on all but three boards (AMALC, SAF, AOA) that represent traditionally male-dominated professions. Female percentage representation was highest with ADA1 (92 percent); NLN (88 percent); APTA (64 percent); ALA (58 percent), ASLHA, APA (40 percent); FNID, NCATE (33 percent); CEPH (30 percent); and ABA (28 percent). Of these, at least four could be characterized as traditionally female-dominated professions. With the exception of those boards already reported with no female representation and those with the lowest percentages (e.g., ABET, three percent), all boards had at least five percent female members.

On the other hand, the profile for minorities on policy-making boards of these agencies revealed much less satisfactory results. Overall, Blacks, Hispanics and other minorities (including one handicapped person) accounted for only 6 percent (N=398) of all board stats, with nine of the board reporting no minority group

members. For those reporting minority persons, the range was: CEPH (30 percent); APA (20 %); ABA (17 %); NCATE (12 %); CORE, ASLHA (10 %); NLN (9 percent); ALA (8 percent); ADA1 (8 percent); APTA (7 percent; AMALC (7 percent); AACSB (6 percent); ADA2 (5 percent): and ABET (1 percent).

In general, women on these boards represented 26 percent and minorities six percent, including five percent Blacks and less than one percent each for Hispanic, Asians, and others. These analyses are graphically depicted on Table 2C below:

TABLE 2C
ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY POLICY MAKING BOARDS

AGENCY	TTL ACCRED	PMB TTL	W	B	H	A	O	C	TTLM
1-3	92	11	1	0	0	0	0	11	0
2-4	175	18	5	2	1	0	0	15	3
3-8	6	14	1	0	0	0	0	13	0
4-9	31	12	1	0	0	0	0	12	0
5-10	15	9	1	0	0	0	0	9	0
6-12	75	6	2	0	0	0	0	6	0
7-13	1527	32	28	1	0	2	0	29	3
8-14	75	10	2	0	0	0	1*	7	1*
9-16	127	15	0	1	0	0	0	14	1
10-17	165	9	1	0	0	0	0	8	0
11-18	47	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	0
12-19	532	22	2	0	0	0	0	20	0
13-20	63	12	7	1	0	0	0	11	1
14-21	796	18	2	1	0	0	0	15	1
15-22	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	0
16-23	525	33	11	3	0	0	1*	29	4
17-24	40	10	3	3	0	0	0	7	3
18-25	149	10	4	1	0	0	0	9	1
19-26	170	13	12	1	0	0	0	12	1
20-30	1352	20	4	1	0	0	0	19	1
21-31	2075	75	2	1	0	0	0	72	1
22-33	193	14	9	1	0	0	0	12	1
23-34	539	10	4	1	1	0	0	8	2
TOTAL	8784	398	102	18	2	2	2	364	24

Legend: Agency-As indicated in figure 1
PMB TTL-Total number of members on Policy Making Boards
W-Women; B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian
TTLM-Total Minorities; TTL ACCRED-Total accredited agencies

Though not always in significant numbers, minorities and women are found in the policy body membership of most accrediting bodies. Only two of the thirty-five agencies reported an all Caucasian male governing board, and they were specialized agencies dealing with a male-dominated profession. Conversely, in those fields historically dominated by women, not only were there male members on the governing bodies but also serving on the professional staff of the agency. While minorities and women were numbered among memberships of the governing boards, the same was not always true for their agency professional, technical, and clerical staffs.

Agency Professional Staff

The ethnic and female make-up of the professional staffs were as shown in Tables 3A-3C:

TABLE 3A
ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF REGIONAL AGENCY PROFESSIONAL STAFF

AGENCY	TOTAL EMPLOYD	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINOR	# OF PROF
		-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-			
1-1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	5
2-5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3
3-6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	0	8
4-7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
5-27	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
6-28	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	5
7-29	2.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.25	1.25	0	2.25
8-32	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
TOTALS	58.75	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	9.25	10.25	2	28.25

Legend: Agency - As indicated in figure 1
TOTAL EMPLD - Total number of all employees for Agency
B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian
TOTAL MINOR - Total number of minorities
OF PROF - Total Number of Professional Staff Members

Again, women fare significantly better than minority group persons in professional employment of regional accrediting agencies, but no woman or minority group person occupies the position of CEO. Specifically, 36 percent of the professional staffs of the reporting agencies are women, while only 7 percent are

minorities, and, parenthetically, those were Black and held positions in the same agency (MSA). Three agencies (i.e., WASCJ, NEAV, WASCS) reported having no women on the professional staff, and only MSA reported minority persons on the professional staff, although an agency (SACS) which previously had employed Black professionals reported one had been contracted but had not yet assumed duties. Of the total number employed by these agencies, 48 percent were professionals.

Other than the one agency shown on Table 3B not reporting any figures for this category, the remainder had a total employment of twenty-eight, of which 16 were professional staff members.

TABLE 3B
ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF INSTITUTIONAL AGENCY PROFESSIONAL STAFF

AGENCY	TOTAL EMPLD	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINOR	# OF PROF
		-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-			
1-2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	4
2-11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	10
3-15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
4-35	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	--	--	NR
TOTALS	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	7	0	16

Legend: Agency - As indicated in figure 1
TOTAL EMPLD - Total number of all employees for Agency
B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian
TOTAL MINOR - Total of Minorities
OF PROF - Staff members

TABLE 3C

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROFESSIONAL STAFF

AGENCY	TOTAL EMPLOYD	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINOR	# OF PROF
		-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-			
1-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	4
2-4	10	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
3-8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
4-9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
5-10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2
6-12	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3
7-13	100	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	13	14	3	20
8-14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
9-16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
10-17	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
11-18	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	9
12-19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	3
13-20	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
14-21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	0	11
15-22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	4
16-23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2
17-24	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
18-25	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.5	.5	0	.5
19-26	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3
20-30	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	9	9	1	18
21-31	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	0	7
22-33	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.3	2.3	0	2.3
23-34	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
TOTALS	302.8	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	45	47.8	39.8	6	98.8

Legend: TTL EMPLOYD - Total number of all employees for Agency
B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian
TOTAL MINOR - Total number of minorities
OF PROF - Total Number of Professional Staff Members

Although 44 percent of the members of the professional staffs of these agencies were women, none was a minority person. And for one of the agencies, the Caucasian females outnumbered the Caucasian males. In that same agency (AICS), the professional staff as a percentage of the total staff employed was quite high (71 percent), and it should be noted that this agency has traditionally accredited business schools related to the preparation of secretaries and other office personnel, though not exclusively.

Fully 50 percent of the professional staff members of the specialized accrediting agencies (cf. Table 3C, p. 32) were women, and of these 96 percent were Caucasian females. And when all minorities reported were taken together, they represented a mere six percent of all professional employees of these participating agencies. Specifically, the data indicated two Black females, two Hispanic males, two Asian males, and no native Americans or other minorities.

The agencies reporting minority staff at this employment level were FNID (33 percent); NLN (15 percent); and SAF, ADA2 (11 percent). However, eighteen of the agencies had no minority professionals on their staffs. Further, with respect to women, there was a significant drop in overall female participation when one traditionally female-dominated professional agency (i.e., NLN) was not considered as part of the analyses. In fact, the percentage changed from 50 percent to 36 percent overall.

In summary, five specialized agencies reported having no women professionals, eighteen had no minorities, and four had neither women nor minorities employed as professional staff. Data showed clearly that women had fared slightly better than men in this category, and the group as a whole could be described as essentially Caucasian -- female and male -- with token minority representation.

Agency Technical Staff

For purposes of analysis and discussion, the data from Tables 4A, 4B, and 4C have been grouped in some cases because of the relatively small numbers involved.

TABLE 4A
ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF REGIONAL AGENCY TECHNICAL STAFF

AGENCY	TOTAL EMPLD	TOTAL TECH.	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINORITY
			-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-		
1-1	13	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	1
2-5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-6	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	0
4-7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
5-27	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6-28	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7-29	2.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8-32	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	58.75	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	1

Legend: Agency - As indicated in Figure 1
TOTAL EMPLD - Total number of all employees for Agency
TOTAL TECH - Technical Staff Members
B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian

Of the regional agencies included, only three reported having technical employees, and all were women. Moreover, of the 19 females there was one Black woman among them.

It was interesting that no males were found in any of the technical positions, but were employed at the clerical level, clearly a departure from the usual stereotype and practice. Although no doubt serendipitous, it represented a form of affirmative action.

TABLE 4B ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF INSTITUTIONAL AGECNY TECHNICAL STAFF

AGENCY	TOTAL EMPLD	TOTAL TECH.	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINORITY
			-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-		
1-2	12	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
2-11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4-35	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTALS	38	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0

Aside from the fact that regional and other institutional bodies either did not have or seldom utilized the technical employee category, those that did reported only females in that job classification.

Of the 64 technical staff persons given in the statistics, 77 percent were women and 20 percent were minorities (i.e., Black or Hispanics). Actually, when regional, other institutional, and specialized agency data were combined, there were no minorities other than Black and Hispanic in the technical employee category.

In addition, the combined totals indicated that of 85 persons found in that category, 10 were Black (2 males and 2 females) and 4 were Hispanic (1 male and 3 females). Further, of the 49 women employed at this level, 61 percent were employed by two agencies (NLN and SAF).

TABLE 4C

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY TECHNICAL STAFF

AGENCY	TOTAL HIRED	TOTAL TECHN	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINORITY
			-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-		
1-3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
2-4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4-9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6-12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7-13	100	40	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	8	22	29	10
8-14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9-16	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
10-17	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
11-18	29	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	0
12-19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13-20	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
14-21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15-22	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	2
16-23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17-24	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18-25	1.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
19-26	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-30	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21-31	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22-32	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23-34	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
TOTALS	302.8	64	2	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	12	39	49	13

Agency Clerical Staff

Although the data for the clerical staffs of the three types of agencies (regional, institutional, specialized) were analyzed, they have not been presented graphically in this report because this employment category is not directly relevant to the policy issue of empowerment strategies for minorities and women in the accrediting process. Therefore, these data have been grouped for purposes of analysis as well as to emphasize commonalities among the data. One hundred percent (N=21) of the clerical workers in the regional agencies were female, and of these 38 percent were Black; no other minority group was represented. And since some of the agencies did not include data on this job category, it might be inferred that the "technical" category was used in lieu of "clerical", and could explain why there was almost an exclusive representation of women in such positions.

Data from the other institutional agencies indicated that one hundred percent of the clerical staff were women, including 50 percent Black from one agency (AICS). The relative size of the general staffs was small; thus, ten positions at this level were equal to 26 percent of the total number of employees. For the specialized agencies, women held 86 percent of the positions reported; minorities and males, 40 percent and 14 percent respectively. Among the specialized, only two agencies reported no employees in this category, and for at least one of them, the agency reportedly depends almost entirely on volunteers to carry out its work.

With regard to women, clearly NLN (n=29), AACSB (n=16), AOA (n=10), ADA2 (n=14), accounted for more than 50 percent of four agencies. Thus, the high number of employees at this level compared favorably with the total number of

employees. In other words, there was close to a 1:2 ratio. On the other hand, only two of the agencies reported comparable data for minorities. They were NLN and ADA2 with 20 and 12 respectively, representing 58 percent of all minorities in this category.

In general, the data demonstrated conclusively that minorities fared better at this level of employment and males fared less well. Specifically, of 400 total clerical employees of regional, institutional and specialized agencies 16 percent or 65 were minorities and 5 percent or 19 were males. And while males had not traditionally been found in abundance in this job category in higher education, it was unusual that the number of minorities was not higher. It must also be noted that regional and other institutional accrediting bodies reported having no males in this job classification.

Consultant/Evaluator Pools

Over one-third of the agency respondents did not complete or did not list minority composition for the item seeking make-up of their evaluator/consultant pool. Therefore, because the numbers for minority persons, both male and female, were quite sparse, data for evaluators, chairpersons, consultants, and other participants in the evaluation and accreditation processes were combined on Tables 5A, 5B, and 5C. And even though the data were not as complete as one might like, they did provide sufficient information upon which to draw useful conclusions and recommendations, if for no other reason than to highlight the need for the agencies to keep more specific data on the incidences of participation of minorities

and women at all levels of accrediting process. In some ways, the lack of such data revealed much more about the degree of seriousness with which gender and ethnic factors have been taken into account by the accrediting community.

Take, for example, the regional agencies (cf. Table 5A) for which there were no specific data reported at all for 63 percent of them. Nevertheless, all of the regional bodies reported at least approximate numbers of persons in the total consultant/evaluator pool. And it was difficult to understand why even gender data were not available for those providing no specific statistics for women and minorities. However, it could be inferred that the agencies did not have computerized records systems, thereby making it less feasible to complete a tally for inclusion in the survey. After all, the eight agencies reported having over 12,615 persons in their consultant/evaluator pools. For the three agencies reporting specific data, 2017 Caucasian males and females were identified in contrast to 223 Blacks, 53 Hispanics, 21 Asian Americans, and 30 other minorities.

TABLE 5A

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF REGIONAL AGENCY CONSULTANT/EVALUATOR POOLS

AGENCY	TOTAL#	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINORITY
		-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-		
1-1	700+	14	14	6	1	4	2	20	9	448	151	177	70
2-5	870	9	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	230	138	146	22
3-6	3500	UNABLE TO COMPLETE										-	--
4-7	1555	NOT COMPLETED										-	--
5-27	2066	INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE										-	--
6-28	3000	94	85	23	17	9	6	1	0	639	411	519	235
7-29	450	NO EXISTING DATA										-	--
8-32	474	COMBINED* MALE AND FEMALE										-	--

*Information reflected only in Total Number of Minorities

Legend: Agency - As indicated in Figure 1
Total # - Total number of accredited Institutions by Agency
B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian

Table 5B shows a similar pattern for the other institutional agencies. Specifically, 735 plus persons in the consultant/evaluator pool were reported; 50 percent of the agencies gave no specific statistics for women and minorities, and those that did report provided significantly contrasting numbers for Caucasians and minorities (i.e., 376 Caucasian males and females were reported as opposed to 4 Blacks, 2 Hispanics, and no Asian Americans or other minorities).

TABLE 5B

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF INSTITUTIONAL AGENCY CONSULTANT/EVALUATOR POOLS

AGENCY	TOTAL#	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINORITY
		-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-		
1-2	110	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	91	5	5	3
2-11	+300	NR	(STATS NOT KEPT)									NR	NR
3-15	225	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	14	14	0
4-35	+100	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTALS	635	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	169	19	19	3

Legend: Agency - As inciated in Figure 1
Total # - Total number of Accredited Institutions by Agency
B - Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian

As indicated in Table 5C, the total number in the consultant/evaluator pool for the specialized agencies registered 4741 persons, and only five agencies either provided no data at all or included only an overall figure without reference to gender or ethnicity. As on other measures in the study, women had a considerably better track record than members of minority groups. Actually, women made up 27 percent of the consultant/evaluator pool, while all minorities accounted for only four percent. In regard to women, the agencies reporting greatest percentages were: CORE, 96 percent; NLN, 92 percent; ALA, 72 percent; FNID, 49 percent; ABHES, 43 percent; APA, 40 percent; AVMA, 25 percent; ADA2, 21 percent; and NAAB, 20 percent. Two agencies (ABA, CPME) reported no women in its consultant/evaluator pool. The profile for minorities expressed as a percentage of the total pool for the specialized agencies was: CORE, 30 percent; ADA1, 24 percent; NAAB, 20 percent; ALA, 13 percent; ABHES, nine percent; APA, eight percent; AMALC, eleven percent; and NLN, four percent. Except for the low percentage registered for NLN in this category, there has been a rather consistent pattern of highs and lows for female and minority participation by specific agencies.

TABLE 5C

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY CONSULTANT/EVALUATOR POOLS

AGENCY	TOTAL#	B		H		A		O		C		TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL MINORITY
		-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-	-M-	-F-		
1-3	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1
2-4	500+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0
4-9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	3	3	0
5-10	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	45	3	3	0
6-12	110	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	53	53	54	4
7-13	150	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	4	132	138	6
8-14	23	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	18	22	7
9-16	300	4	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	158	20	42	22
10-17	200	4	1	4	7	1	0	0	0	46	78	86	17
11-18	225	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	193	26	28	6
12-19	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	9	9	0
13-20	120	5	7	2	0	1	1	0	0	68	78	86	16
14-21	100+	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
15-22	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	7	7	0
16-23	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
17-24	440	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	56	22	24	5
18-25	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
19-26	70	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	194	211	17
20-30	330	7	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	148	65	68	13
21-31	1200	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
22-33	NR	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	27	191	196	6
23-34	730	16	14	9	5	7	4	2	1	1060	267	291	58
TOTALS	4882	41	52	26	20	14	12	6	7	2082	1166	1269	178

Legend: Agency - As indicated in Figure 1
Total # - Total number of Accredited Institutions by Agency
B-Black; H-Hispanic; A-Asian; O-Other; C-Caucasian

Agency Policies, Procedures and Strategies

In addition to the lack of detailed information in responses to questions on ethnicity of consultant/evaluators, there was usually no information provided or incomplete responses to inquiries about agency policies, procedures and strategies related to the participation of women and minorities in various aspects of the accrediting process. For example, a tabulation of the responses to the question concerning the existence of formal policies assuring or promoting participation by women and minorities revealed that three-fourths of the agencies reporting had no formal or written policy except for nondiscrimination declarations (cf. Table 6).

TABLE 6

ASSURING/PROMOTING PARTICIPATION POLICY

Formal Policy	6
Informal Policy	8
No Policy	9
Other means*	1

*Establishment of a committee on Under-represented Constituencies of the Association

Most respondents, however, declared in written comments that they actively seek to identify qualified women and minorities, then do select and use them regularly. From only a couple of the agencies was the response that neither gender nor ethnicity was a conscious factor in the selection process. And assuming that all accrediting agencies in the survey focus upon competence and professional credentials as critical to accrediting work (highlighted by ADA1 and ABET), other agencies -- through policy documents or references to tradition -- expressed their commitment to equity. For example, one agency (CORE) was unequivocal in its response:

> In the selection of Commission members, CORE considers a number of factors to ensure fairness of representation and objectivity in decision making. Geography, sex, racial minority status, disability, relevant experience, etc. [are considered].

Another (APTA) had already adopted fairly detailed policies and plans to increase the number of minority professionals in the field and to "foster minority representation and participation" in all activities of the profession in general and the association in particular.

Since it was important to determine how the consultant/evaluator pools were formed and maintained, it was useful to document how individuals became involved as team members, chairpersons, consultants or in other roles in the accrediting process. By far, the results (cf Table 7) suggests that most individuals became actively involved as a result of nomination by the chief executive officer or dean of the college/university; solicitation by staff of the agency; recommendations of other evaluators; membership in the professional organization or association; or self-nominations.

TABLE 7

AGENCY CONSULTANT/EVALUATOR SELECTION PROCEDURES

Recommended by President/Dean	10
Recommended by Agency Staff	5
Recommended by Other Evaluators	2
Self-Recommendations/Nominations	4
Solicitations by Agency	9
Other (Referrals)	5
None or N/A	3
By Membership in Organization/Agency	5

Thus, there was sufficient support for the declaration that efforts were made to include women and minorities on visiting teams... "Especially where student minority enrollment patterns make it important." Taken in the most positive vein, such a statement could attest to the sensitivity of the agency to include minority persons on teams visiting predominately Black or Hispanic institutions. Taken negatively, however, it could mean that minority expertise and participation would be limited to such settings. As one means of improving the situation, a number of agency respondents reported internal discussion over the past three years on equity and the possible development of more proactive policies. One agency (APA) reported the existence of a "Committee on Underrepresented Constituencies" established in 1984. Apparently, it had already been successful in increasing the percentage of the affected groups in its accrediting process.

Next, agencies were asked to indicate the problems associated with identifying, selecting, and using qualified women and minorities in the accrediting process. As was so strongly confirmed by the data reported on Table 8, the the largest group (44 percent) of respondents cited the limited pool(s) from which to draw minorities

and women, moreso for the former than the latter. With respect to women and minorities, the problem of limited pools from which to draw would apply only in some disciplines and professional/technical areas, whereas for women the pools of prospective consultant/evaluators could be considerably larger as a resource provided the agencies and institutions were more aggressive in identifying women and minorities.

TABLE 8 REPORTED PROBLEMS IN IDENTIFYING MINORITIES AND WOMEN

Time Considerations	1
Limited Pool from which to draw	16
Family Considerations	1
Inability to Communicate in English	1
Lack of professional leave	1
Availability	3
Limited agency exposure	1
Few nominations of M/W are recommended	4
None or N/A	8

Also significant was the fact that 22 percent reported having no difficulties in identifying minorities and women for service in the accrediting process. Other reasons given, including one alleging the inability of the potential [minority] evaluator to communicate in English--clearly a reason with overtones of racism and cultural bias.

In addition, a consistent problem reported was the small number of minorities "in upper level and administrative/faculty ranks from which to choose." A sizable number of agencies perceived another problem in the narrow range of discipline areas in which minority groups are found...the social sciences and ethnic studies

areas rather than in the physical and natural sciences. Similarly, in administrative areas, prospects were reported to be in affirmative action, equal education opportunity, financial aid level offices in contrast to upper echelon academic and business offices. Several respondents observed most minority professionals are found in public colleges and universities, resulting in problems of identifying minority evaluators with backgrounds in private institutions, to serve on visits to the private sector.

Although over fifty percent of the respondents indicated they encountered no problems in selecting minorities and women for the visiting teams, others cited the limited range of disciplinary areas and lack of experience, among others. By contrast, reported earlier was the finding that problems centered around the limited pool from which to draw. To be sure, the questions about limited disciplinary areas of women and minorities and the limited pools are related.

Commenting on the problems in using minorities and women on teams, several agency respondents made the observation that their minority evaluators are often prone to reject an invitation to serve because of competing demands and time commitments. Several respondents reported experiences described in the statement of one: "The number of minority evaluators who withdraw prior to a visit after accepting are significantly higher than other groups." Another perspective, however, was found in the observation of several agency respondents. One wrote, "Our rejection rate of minority evaluators is easily two to three times that of other groups by the institutions being evaluated."

The agencies were also asked to describe specific actions taken to expand participation of women and minorities in the accrediting process over the last three years. Most reported activities which essentially could be characterized as promulgating non-discrimination policy statements. Several had sent special letters

inviting member institutions to submit special lists of nominees from their minority and women cadre. One regional accrediting commission reported concerted efforts to identify, recruit, and train women and minorities through a series of special workshops as well as through promotional literature sent to its membership. As previously noted, another agency has a "Committee on Underrepresented Constituencies" which was credited with already increasing the percentage of affected groups in their accrediting process.

The Institution

The response of the institutions were first separated according to the type of accreditation, institutional as opposed to specialized/professional. The institutional responses were then examined on the basis of the different regional institution accreditation bodies. The instrument was designed to gain a perspective of policies and practices relevant to (1) self-study, (2) institutional input to accrediting agency consultant/evaluator membership, (3) the minority profile of the institution and (4) the institution's policies and practices in supporting as well as recognizing participation of its faculty and administrators in the accrediting process.

The policy of institutions in identifying participants for self-study committees and task groups as well as the make-up of such groups was also addressed (cf. Table 9).

TABLE 9

POLICY FOR SELECTING MEMBERSHIP
ON SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY (Institutional)

Region	N	Volunteers	Appointees	Both
NCA	N-34	4	19	11
MSA	N=30	4	13	13
SACS	N=40	2	31	7
NEA	N=10	1	5	4
NWA	N=14	3	7	4
WASC	N=29	7	14	8
ALL REGIONS	159	21	89	47

Approximately seventy percent (157 institutions) responded to this issue. Almost sixty percent of the institutions that responded indicated they appointed members to the self-study committees while 13 percent had a voluntary policy; and 30 percent determined membership through a combined approach wherein both volunteers and appointees were utilized.Interestingly, 80 percent of the institutions that appointed self-study members did have ethnic representation comparable to the percent of minorities reported in the institutional profile of full-time faculty and administrators. The volunteer policy institutions were less representative of their full-time faculty and administrator minority profile. Only fifty-four percent of this

group had comparable representation, suggesting minorities may not step forward and voluntarily involve themselves in the internal accrediting process. Where both volunteer and appointee procedures were followed, one hundred percent of the self-study participant population had minority representation comparable to the ratio among full-time faculty and administrators. Very few of the respondent institutions had self-study minority representation comparable to the reported percentage of minority student enrollment, however.

Table 10 provides a context for understanding the incidence of minority presence among the students, faculty and administrations of the institutions surveyed. The data have consistently underscored the parallel relationships that exist between percentages of minorities at each level in higher education and the rate of participation in the accrediting process. For example, almost 18 percent of the institutions reported they had no minority persons in the category of student, faculty or administration; more to the point, fully 80 percent of the institutions reported at least six percent minority students while only about 45 percent reported at least six percent minority faculty and staff.

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE Minorities
Among Students, Faculty
and Administrators of
Respondent Institutions

%	Students	Faculty	Administration	Totals
1-5	40	71	34	145
6-10	45	49	37	131
11-16	41	14	16	71
17-25	25	12	16	53
26-40	24	6	10	40
41-65	17	1	6	24
66+	12	1	2	15
none	2	34	67	103
TOTAL	206	188	188	582

Answers to questions concerning institutional involvement in the process of accrediting agency participant identification were noticeably less often completed or were vague and general rather than specific or detailed as found in other sections of the institution return. There seemed to be ambivalence in the pattern and content of written comments. When requested to provide an actual count of the composition of the visiting accrediting team by gender and ethnicity of the chairperson, members, and agency staff, it was obvious that many either had no recollection; had not been present during the visit, had no access to such information; or simply indicated that they were all Caucasians. But for those that did respond with information about minority involvement, Table 11 provides a profile quite consistent with the findings in other sections of this study. The data for all regions were combined for purposes of analysis and interpretation. Obviously, the

numbers given were a duplicated count in some instances; thus, they should be interpreted as occasions or incidences of minority and female participation, as reported by the institutions that were visited.

TABLE 11

MINORITY COMPOSITION OF VISITING TEAMS
ALL-REGION SUMMARY

Team Role	B		H		A		O			
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	TTL WOMEN	TTL MINORITY
Chair	8	1	7	2	2	0	0	0	3	20
Member	45	38	14	13	3	3	4	0	54	120
Staff	13		0	1	0	0	0	0	3	14
TOTAL	66	39	21	16	5	3	4	0	58	154

When asked to estimate the number of faculty and administrators who actively serve on evaluation teams or committees of the accrediting agencies, many of the respondents recorded the number 0. And of those that recorded specific statistics, 81 indicated that no women were involved while 131 reported that no minorities were actively serving. Actually, the average percentage rate for women was 29 percent and for minorities it was 9 percent. On the other hand, the data revealed that 62 institutions (N=168) had at least one-third female involvement whereas 30 reported at least 10 percent minority involvement.

When asked what persons, by title, in the institution had responsibility for recommending potential evaluators/consultants, over half did not respond, implying they did not know. The others (Cf. Table 12) reported the president as the one responsible for nominating three times as often as any other person, followed by

persons with the title of vice president, provost, or dean. Other administrators, faculty, and self-study chairpersons were only occasionally reported as a source for identification and nomination. It was apparent that the identification and selection policies of the accrediting agencies were not well known within the member institutions of this study.

TABLE 12

RESPONSIBILITY FOR RECOMMENDING POTENTIAL EVALUATORS

Accrediting Team Chairperson	5
President	162
Vice President/Provost	55
Dean	55
Department Chairperson	8
Other	8
None	1

In an effort to determine whether institutional policies and practices facilitate and encourage participation in the accrediting process, it was asked what leave policy covered faculty and staff who do work for accrediting agencies. Fifteen institutions reported participation would be classified as professional leave but without pay. Two institutions reported participants would have to claim the time under personal days and four indicated participation would be classified as vacation days. All of the other respondents reported such participation would come under professional leave policy with pay (cf. Table 1B, p. 19).

As previously observed, there were relatively few written comments on the

institutional returns. Several that were, however, deserve to be reported. A number of the respondents indicated that their union contract precludes consideration of participation in the accrediting process for such things as promotion and tenure, merit pay, or professional recognition. Two of the respondents commented they felt accrediting teams were balanced and fairly representative of women and minorities, implying inferences of underrepresentation. One respondent observed: "Greater effort is needed to assure that accreditation visiting teams reflect concerns in the composition of the student body whether the College's staff does or not." Another respondent declared, "Serving on an evaluation team may be the best in-service training available!"

When the institutional responses covering specialized/professional accrediting activities are examined, there is amazing consistency and similarity in all of the areas covered. The only exception was the fact that the respondents for specialized accreditation more often included department/division chair as the one responsible for recommending potential evaluators/consultants. They were less certain about the ethnicity of their own self-study groups and that of the accrediting teams, however. This group was almost unanimous in judging participation in the accrediting process as prestigious and enhancing professional upward mobility, although several commented such mobility is not an aspiration of most faculty members.

The Participants

The survey instrument was designed to gather information on the perceived criteria and source of qualification and selection for participation from those who actually had served. In addition, information on perceived empowerment from such participation was sought. This group was asked to identify perceived institutional and accrediting agency level barriers to the identification, selection, and utilization of women and minorities in the accrediting process. In addition, recommendations were solicited for those who aspire to become involved as well as for action at the institutional and accrediting agency level.

The participant profile reflected in responses to this survey was startling. Ninety percent of the respondents were female Caucasians. Among the few males responding, half were Black and half were Hispanic. The evidence was clear; very few minorities are identified at the institutional level. Of the women and minorities reporting, twenty-five percent had served as a chairperson. As far as their professional position within their institution is concerned, 85 percent occupy administrative positions at the Associate Dean through the Department Chair level. Only fifteen percent were at the Dean through President levels. The small percentage in the upper administrative echelons is consistent with the profile of women and minorities in higher education administration as reported by Astin (1982), Moore (1984), and Frances and Mensel (1981).

When asked the source of initial nomination to serve for an accrediting agency, an internal source was reported in 80 percent of the cases. The nominator usually was the president or executive vice president and occasionally a dean or department chair. Approximately ten percent of the respondents indicated an external source

of identification and nomination, usually visiting team chairs and/or accrediting agency staff...usually as a result of exemplary work on the self-study. About ten percent of the respondents did not know the source of their original identification for this service.

Respondents were asked to prioritize a list of possible factors which could have been the basis of their selection and nomination ranging from work activities to personal relationships and personal characteristics. Based on a weighted scale, participants serving institutional accrediting agencies identified highest to lowest: position, area of expertise, activities in institution, a mentor/sponsor, gender, professional alliances, activities in professional organizations, race, and activities in community or state groups. The respondents who serve specialized/professional accrediting agencies gave somewhat different rankings: area of expertise, position, activities in professional organization, professional alliances, activities in the institution, and mentor/sponsor. Interestingly, none of these respondents indicated race or activities in community or state groups as a factor.

Another item on the survey instrument asked those who had identified a mentor/sponsor as contributing to their selection to check a series of characteristics which would describe that individual. The overwhelming characteristic pattern produced a profile of Caucasian, male, administrator, superior. This finding, of course, is consistent with the literature on mentors/sponsors (Kram, 1980, 1983, 1985; Moore, 1984).

Participants were also asked to prioritize those factors which seemed to have contributed to actual selection by the accrediting agency. The important factors in rank order identified by the respondents who serve institutional accrediting agencies were: area of expertise, position/title, reputation, character of the institution visited, activities in the profession, and make-up of the visiting team.

There were only slight differences perceived between this participant group and those who serve specialized/professional agencies.

The latter group agreed area of expertise and position were the two most important but identified character of institution visited as the third most important and activities in the profession as the fourth most important factor. Reputation and the make-up of the visiting team followed as perceived selection criteria.

The nature and scope of empowerment associated with the accrediting process as perceived by those who actually participate was also examined. Two aspects of empowerment, external and internal, were reported. Respondents indicated observed or experienced evidence of empowerment as a result of their accrediting process participation among administrators and faculty peers within their institution and within their own profession. Ninety percent of the respondents indicated perceived empowerment among administrators in their institution and an equal percentage identified empowerment from the internal perspective of self-awareness or self-esteem.

Respondents were then asked to indicate actual evidence of empowerment among the institutional peers and administrators. Over one-half reported they had experienced their recommendations were sought and/or translated into action and they experienced greater cooperation from superiors as a result of empowerment derived from their accrediting process participation, among other things. A third of the respondents indicated they had experienced expansion of job responsibilities or authority as a result of such empowerment.

We were also interested in knowing what personal empowering outcomes were credited to participation in the accrediting process. Fifty percent of the respondents indicated they gained an increased sense of self-confidence and established connections in professional networks as a result of their experience.

Almost as large a number indicated they had been stimulated to professional development activities as a result of their participation and almost one-third of the respondents indicated they had experienced increased professional aspirations as a result of their involvement. An analysis of the responses from the participants in specialized/professional accrediting were consistent in every category with those who participated in institutional accreditation. They had experienced or observed empowerment among their administrators and peers in their own institution as well as within their profession in addition to self-awareness and esteem. They had found recommendations sought and followed, greater cooperation among administrators and faculty as well as formal advancement as a result of participation. Finally, they experienced similar patterns of personal empowering from self-confidence and connections to stimulation of professional development and increased work engagements.

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The foregoing data analyses, within the conceptual framework of empowerment for minorities and women in the accrediting process, have resulted in the following major findings related to accrediting agencies, accredited institutions and programs as well as individual participants.

1. Perhaps the most important finding regarding accrediting agencies and institutions emanating from the study is related to the need for better data on the participation of minorities and women in the accreditation process. Both in the collection and analysis of data phases of the study, it became clear that a significant number of the agencies, regional and specialized, had incomplete data collection and management information systems, particularly related to the participation of minorities and women in the accreditation process. Even those agencies that have apparently implemented automated systems have not deemed it necessary to have a breakdown according to sex and ethnicity. Still others had partial records either because the management information system is new or because there had been several changes in policy concerning the collection of such data. But, for whatever reason, statistics --particularly for minority groups--are sparse. Nevertheless, this study does provide the higher

education community and the public -at-large with actual data on the extent of minority and female participation on the policy-making boards as well as on the professional, technical and clerical staffs of the accrediting bodies. To a lesser degree, data has been made available also on the minority and female profiles of the consultant/evaluator pools of the accrediting bodies.

2. Significantly, 89 percent of the respondent institutions viewed participation in accreditation activities as being prestigious and as an enhancer of professional mobility, and nearly all individual participants indicated that their involvement had resulted already in some form of empowerment. Such empowerment evidence was also noted after an examination of responses related to professional growth policies. Clearly, 90 percent of the institutions viewed accreditation as important enough to allow faculty and staff to participate as consultants/evaluators on professional leave with pay. Moreover, personnel policies from 50 percent or more of the respondent institutions included specific references to accreditation participation as a factor to be considered in promotion, tenure, and other forms of recognition.

3. As for accrediting agency policy-making boards, all but three reported female representation; however, 12 regional, institutional, and specialized agencies reported <u>zero</u> minority board membership. As a policy issue, this is a particularly significant finding since both COPA

(Council on Postsecondary Accreditation) and USDE/DEAE recognition criteria have nondiscriminatory declarations and call for representation of the "public interest." Nevertheless, women have fared better than members of minority

groups in terms of representation on these boards, but in only two agencies (i.e., NLN and ADA1) did women represent a majority on the board. Further, of 628 board members reported by all agencies, only one out of every 11 board members was either Black, Hispanic, Asian American, Native American, or other minority in contrast to one out of every four board members who was a woman.

4. Minorities and women have significantly less representation on the professional staffs of the regional agencies, even though the percentage for women (36 percent) was higher than that for minorities (seven percent). And the latter figure for minorities represents two Black professionals employed by the same agency (MSA); the other agency (SACS) that had previously employed Black professionals was in the process of adding another Black male to its professional staff. However, no woman or minority person was employed as the chief executive officer in any of the regional or other institutional accrediting agencies. The situation, when described in percentages, was slightly better for the other institutional and specialized accrediting bodies. For example, one institutional agency (AICS) employed more Caucasian females (60 percent) than males, and as a group specialized accrediting bodies had approximately the same number of women and men. On the other hand, the data revealed also that five specialized agencies had no female professionals, 18 had no minorities at this level of employment, and four had neither women nor minorities employed as professional staff.

5. Although this policy research related to the involvement and empowerment of minorities and women--particularly at the professional level--data reported on

the status of minorities and women at the technical and clerical levels have been useful in providing a complete analysis of involvement in accreditation by these groups at all levels. Moreover, the data suggested that the technical and clerical categories are interchangeable. More important, both categories were staffed almost exclusively by women. And minorities did better at this level of employment; 65 minorities were in clerical positions as opposed to only eight minority persons employed in professional positions of all accrediting bodies (i.e., regional, institutional, and specialized).

6. While 23 of the 35 accrediting agencies reported the actual or approximate size of their consultant/evaluator pools, less specific data were reported or available on the gender or ethnicity/race of the participants in accrediting activities. Consultant/evaluator pools for regional, institutional, and specialized agencies in the aggregate were 12,615 and 4882 respectively; however, few agencies provided a breakdown by gender or ethnicity/race. Of those that provided such data on the participation levels of minorities and women for the 1982-85 period, regional agencies indicated that minority persons had been assigned as evaluators or consultants 327 times; other institutional agencies had made three such assignments; and specialized agencies reported 178 incidences of minority consultant/evaluator assignment. For women, these numbers were higher but still represented only about seven percent of the pools of all regional agencies, less than one percent of the pools in other institutional bodies, and four percent of the total pool for specialized agencies.

7. Overall, it can be concluded that there was little perceptible difference in the experience of regional/institutional accrediting bodies versus specialized

accrediting bodies with respect to the question of female and minority participation in the accrediting process at any level. If there were even a minor variation, it would be related to the historical role played by some specialized agencies as female-dominated professional groups (i.e., NLN, ADA1). Of course, this slight difference often was the reason for higher percentage female participation in general. In more concrete terms, these agencies caused some inflation in the numbers and percentages, and made the total specialized component of the study appear more positive about women's equity than warranted.

8. And even though women as a category of underrepresented persons in the accrediting process apparently had made some significant gains in the last few years, the pattern was not the same for minority women. For example, only one minority female (Black) was reported among all institutional accrediting agency professional staff members.

9. While both institutional and specialized agencies asserted that they actively seek to identify minorities and women, most did not have written policies, procedures, or strategies to promote or assure in a formal way the participation of these underrepresented groups in the accrediting process. But more important as a policy issue was the fact that some agencies did not consider gender or ethnicity/race as important factors in the selection process, clearly at odds with a positive approach to equity and broader interpretations of the nondiscriminatory provisions of COPA and USDE/DEAE. Conversely, one agency (CORE) could be considered a model for emulation by other agencies, especially in its detailed written policies and inclusive philosophy concerning factors to be used in the selection process.

10. In terms of how persons get added to the consultant/evaluator pools, was overwhelming evidence that most evaluators are either recruited by the agencies themselves or they are recommended by the dean or chief executive officer of the college or university. And since the respondents are reported that most often recommended are other deans and top level administrators, there would appear to be a correlation between the low number of minorities and women at these administrative levels in the institutions and the under-representation of minorities and women in the accrediting process. In fact, many of the participants alleged that the "old boys network" played a major role in selection process.

Recommendations

The foregoing analyses and discussion of findings and conclusions have resulted in several important recommendations for the accrediting agencies, institutions involved in the accrediting process, as well as for individual participants in the process, with particular emphasis on ways to improve the participation rate of minorities and women.

The Accrediting Agencies

1) Should develop and/or implement improved data collection and management information systems that will include more specific information on gender and ethnicity/race of all participants in the accrediting process, including membership on policy-making boards; committees; professional, technical and clerical staffs; volunteers (i.e., team chairpersons, evaluation or visiting team members, consultants); and others associated with agency activities. Likewise, records should be maintained by regional, institutional and specialized agencies on the number of persons, by gender and ethnicity/race, who either decline invitations to serve or who withdraw after having accepted invitations to serve.

2. Should, with the assistance of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), promote greater participation by minorities and women in the accrediting process as a means of ensuring equity and broader empowerment of

these underrepresented groups. At a minimum, accrediting agencies, through COPA, could develop and promulgate policy statements regarding this issue. COPA could also take the leadership in promoting greater awareness and sensitivity to the subject of broadening the participation of minorities and women in the accrediting process by sponsoring or cosponsoring workshops and professional development seminars (During the course of the study, COPA already expressed a desire to assist in the promulgation of the study results via its professional development seminars).

3. Should take affirmative steps to assure that its essential of nondiscrimination is met by all member and candidate institutions, thereby resulting in larger pools of potential minorities and women for all aspects and levels of the accrediting process, as required in the recognition criteria used by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) and the Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation (DEAE) of the United States Department of Education.

4. Should involve more minorities and women from all types of higher education institutions (including predominantly Black and Hispanic colleges as well as women's colleges) in their activities. That would mean more minorities and women on accrediting commissions, governing boards, evaluation teams, etc.

5. Should become more aggressive in identifying qualified minorities and women to be trained for leadership roles as team chairpersons, consultant and special visitors, rather than relying solely on the institutional chief executive

officer or academic dean (who are rarely minority or female role models) to nominate deserving and competent minority and female individuals.

6. Should, as a commitment to a broader social policy of access and empowerment of minorities and women as underrepresented groups in the accrediting process, ensure that these groups have some representation on policy-making boards particularly since minorities and women appear to have significant representation among the constituent members of the accrediting bodies. As a policy issue, such representation would seem unavoidable because of the agencies own mandates for nondiscrimination and broad public representation, even for agencies representing professions having few minorities and women.

7. Should admonish evaluation team members to review the institution's commitment to equity in enrollment and employment in consonance with the college's own stated objectives. While visiting teams should not be prescriptive in their recommendations, team reports should contain recommendations reflecting the team's assessment of progress in the institution's own affirmative action program, including the level of involvement of minority and women in self-study, evaluation and planning processes.

8. Should, in the process of recruiting for professional and technical staff, make a real commitment to the employment of Blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, Native Americans, other minorities and women as professionals and technicians who eventually could have the same career path opportunities as Caucasian

males, including the role of chief executive officer (a position held by no woman or minority person in the regional/institutional agencies and by few in the specialized agencies). Consequently, all accrediting bodies should make greater use of minority and women's professional organizations and networks in the recruitment and employment of such persons. In addition, accrediting bodies should consider developing their own internship programs for minorities and women so that a cadre of persons from these underrepresented groups would be available for newly established or vacated professional or technical positions in the agencies.

9. Should take appropriate steps to assure that their consultant/evaluator pools have adequate representation of minorities and women and that such persons are assigned regularly to all evaluation/visiting teams and other accrediting activities, regardless of whether minorities or women make up a "significant" component of visited institution or program enrollment. As a policy issue related to empowerment, women and minorities visiting predominantly Caucasian and male institutions could be observed by students and their faculty/staff peers in positions/roles of influence, authority, and prestige. On the other hand the accrediting agencies should be particularly sensitive to the unique needs of those institutions having predominantly minority or female enrollments in making team assignments--not always in the past representing a majority of female or minority team members. And even though women as a group had made significant strides during the last few years, accrediting agencies should concentrate on improving their record of assignments to Black women who have lagged far behind Caucasian males, Caucasian females, and Black males.

10. More experienced minorities and women evaluators as well as key administrators and faculty should be identified and trained as team chairpersons, which would be clearly a statement of power and real empowerment.

Institutions

1. Should, in order to respond appropriately to the accrediting agencies for qualified minority and female evaluators and other personnel, make a greater commitment to the appointment of minorities and women to fulltime faculty and high level administrative positions in response to their own affirmative action plans and of commitments to equity in official mission and goals statements.

2. Should improve their record-keeping systems with regard to the participation of minorities and women in all activities, particularly with respect to self-study evaluation, planning, and accrediting activities. Since most institutions have now adopted, in whole or in part, some form of computerized database, such improved statistics on the role of minorities would be rather easy to implement and maintain.

3. Should encourage minorities and women to participate in accrediting activities by continuing or adopting policies that allow such participation to be used as professional growth, including professional leave with pay, as a factor in promotion/tenure decisions, merit pay and other forms of recognition and benefits.

4. Should assist minorities and women as prospective consultant/evaluators for the accrediting process by cooperating in internship arrangements offered by accrediting bodies, COPA, and other professional groups (e.g., ACE/Academic Administrative Internship Program, HERS Women's Summer Institute, Hispanic Fellows Institute, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, etc.); and should assist these underrepresented groups in attending workshops and conferences devoted to self-study and accreditation (e.g., Self-Study and Accreditation Workshops conducted jointly by Rutgers University and Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools).

5. Should review carefully evaluation/visiting team rosters developed by accrediting bodies to assure that minorities and women are represented.

6. Should regularly assist accrediting bodies in the identification of prospectiveminority and female evaluators, consultants, board and committee members, team chairpersons, professional and technical staff members, as well as others related to the accrediting process (e.g., requests for nominations of persons to serve on state and federal panels dealing with the issue of accreditation).

7. Should assist accrediting agencies in research related to minority and female involvement and empowerment in the accrediting process.

Participants (Minorities and Women)

1) Should, as a prerequisite for real empowerment, develop a keener awareness of the accreditation process and its impact on their overall development.

2) Should take the initiative in requesting that they be recommended as potential evaluators by their own institutions or by other experienced evaluators and chairpersons.

3) Should place accreditation as a higher priority and resist the temptation to reject invitations to serve in any capacity in the accrediting process, particularly as evaluators or chairpersons.

4) Should volunteer to serve on campus self-study committees, program review committees, and planning groups, since minority and female persons may be "inadvertently" overlooked.

5) Should examine evaluation/visiting team rosters developed by the accrediting agencies to determine whether minorities and women are represented; if not, these groups should bring the matter to the attention of the chief executive officer of institution for appropriate response to the accrediting agency.

6) Should take full advantage of minority and women's educational and professional networks in seeking full involvement and empowerment in the accrediting process, including, as necessary, the establishment and utilization of new "overlooked persons networks."

7) Should develop positive self-concepts (i.e., minorities), so that all issues will not become "colorless". As a policy issue, minorities should be assigned to various accrediting activities because of other needed cultural dimensions, just as it is important for women to be represented to assure that appropriate female perspectives are considered in the search for quality and excellence.

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
State & Regional Higher Education Center
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
(904-644-4706)

NATIONAL SURVEY ON:

PARTICIPATION OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN THE ACCREDITING PROCESS

ACCREDITING AGENCY FORM

Agency Reporting: _____
Name

Person Reporting: _____
Name and Title

Agency Address: _____

_____ _____
Zip Code

Telephone: _____

Number of Recognized Institutions:

Member/Accredited: _____)
) Total: _____
Candidate: _____)

PART I: Accrediting Governing Body and Agency Staff

A. Total membership of the policy making body-
(Commission or Council): _____
Of the membership, how many are Women_____; Black _____;
Hispanic_____; Asian American_____; Other Minority_____;
and Caucasian_____?

B. Agency Staff: Total Number employed: _____
(Please complete the box below.)

Agency Staff	Professional		Technical		Clerical	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Black						
Hispanic						
Asian American						
Other Minority						
Caucasian						
TOTALS						

PART II: Evaluator/Consultant Participation

A. Total Number in Consultant/Evaluator Pool:_____

B. Over the past three years, what numbers of the following groups were used in carrying out Agency responsibilities?

Evaluator/ Consultant Pool	Evaluator		Chairperson		Consultant		Other Professional Assignment	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Black								
Hispanic								
Asian American								
Other Minority								
Caucasian								
TOTALS								

PART III. Policies Affecting Participation of Minorities and Women

A. Does the Agency have a policy which_____assures/_____promotes participation of women and minorities in its accrediting and evaluation process? (Check the most appropriate descriptor.)

If it promotes participation, please describe briefly and/or attach a copy of the appropriate document containing the policy statement.

If the Agency only assures participation, are there plans to implement a different approach in the future?

_____Yes _____No

B. What Agency procedures are there for enlisting persons to serve as consultants, evaluators, and chairpersons in the accrediting process? (Please describe briefly in the space provided, or attach appropriate documents.)

C. Based on past experience, what problems confront the Agency in identifying qualified women and minorities to participate in the accrediting process?

What problems have been encountered in selecting them for participation in the accrediting process?

What problems have been encountered in using them in the accrediting process?

D. Please describe any specific actions taken by the Agency to expand participation of minorities and women in the accrediting process over the last three (3) years?

E. Has there been any discussion over the last three (3) years on equity policies in involving minorities and/or women in the accrediting process?

_____Yes _____No

F. It has been said that participation in the accrediting process is viewed as prestigious and may even enhance the professional upward mobility of the participants.

Do you ____agree, or ____disagree, on the basis of your observations?

For Institutional Use - Additional Data, Comments, Suggestions, etc.:

DATE COMPLETED:

_____

Month Day Year

* * * * * * * * *

Please return completed form within seven days to:

Dr. Louis W. Bender, Director
State & Regional Higher Education Center
Florida State University
College of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

August, 1986
KJM

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
State & Regional Higher Education Center
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
(904-644-4706)

NATIONAL SURVEY ON:
PARTICIPATION OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN THE ACCREDITING PROCESS

INSTITUTIONAL FORM

This form has been designed for use in reporting information relative to either institutional and/or specialized program accreditation; a separate form should be completed for each type involving self-study. Please machine copy the number of forms needed to permit reporting all accrediting activities since 1982.

Institution Reporting: _____
Name

Person Reporting: _____
Name and Title

Institution's Address: _____

_____ _____
Zip Code

Telephone: ( ) - _____

Name of the Accrediting Agency having jurisdiction for the accrediting activities covered in this report: _____

_____

Site visit date(s): _____
Month and Year

PART I. Self-Study Participation

A. What was the total number of faculty _____; administrators _____; other (e.g., Board of Trustee members) _____ who would have been eligible to participate in the self-study process in your institution? Of the total potential pool, how many actually officially participated in the self-study process?:

	Steering Committee		Sub-Committee		Special Task Group		Board Member	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Black								
Hispanic								
Asian American								
Other Minority								
Caucasian								
TOTALS								

Were these persons ____ Volunteers; ____ Appointees?
(If both categories apply, please insert percentage estimates.)

PART II. Please indicate (actual count) the composition of the visiting accrediting team:

	Chairperson		Members		Accrediting Agency Staff	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Black						
Hispanic						
Asian American						
Other Minority						
Caucasian						
TOTALS						

PART III. Institutional Involvement in the Team Selection Process

A. Estimate the number of faculty or administrators from your institution who actively serve on evaluation teams or committees of the Accredting Agency: Total Number _____. Of these, what percent are women _____%; and what percent are minority _____%

B. Please list the names and titles of women and/or minorities you know who have served on accreditation teams during the past three academic years - 1982-83 to the present. (Use page 4 if additional space is needed.)

NAME TITLE

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

(Please add an asterisk (*) to the names of those who have served as a chairperson.)

C. Which persons (by title) in your institution have responsibility for recommending potential evaluators to the Accrediting Agency (ies)?

TITLES: _____/_____

_____/_____

PART IV. Institutional Profile

	Total Headcount			Actual or Estimated Percent of Minorities
	M	F	TOTAL	
Students				
Full-Time Faculty				
Full-Time administrators				

PART V. Institutional Policies and Practices

A. Faculty and Staff are permitted to participate in evaluation and accreditation activities under which the following leave policy?:

____ Professional (with pay) ____ Personal Day(s)

____ Professional (without pay) ____ Vacation Day(s)

B. Is participation considered a positive factor as part of professional growth ____ Yes/ ____No; of promotion/ tenure ____ Yes/____No; of merit pay consideration ____Yes/____no; of any other professional recogni-ion/ benefit ____Yes/____No.

C. It has been said that participation in the accrediting process as an evaluator or consultant for an accrediting agency is viewed as prestigious and may even enhance the professional upward mobility of the participants.

On the basis of your observations, do you ____Agree, or ____ Disagree with the perception?

D. Other Comments and/or Suggestions

G. Other Comments and/or Suggestions:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date completed:

_____
Month , Day Year

* * * * * * * * * *

Please return completed form within seven (7) days to:

Dr. Louis W. Bender, Director
State & Regional Higher Education Center
Florida State University
College of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

August, 1986
KJM

REFERENCES

Abramson, J. 1975. The Invisible Woman: Discrimination in the Academic Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Allen, Robert W. and Porter, Lyman W. 1983. Organizational Influence Processes. Glenview: Illinois. Scott Foresman.

Anderson, William Jr.; Anderson, Henry; and Toyl, Lewis. Winter, 1979. "Black Survival in White Academe." Journal of Negro Education Vol. XLVIII, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press. p. 101.

Association of Governing Boards., Composition of Governing Boards, 1985. AGB Special Report. Washington, D.C: AGB. pp. 3, 9.

Astin, Alexander M. 1982. Minorities in American Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bender, L. W. 1983. "State Accreditation" and "Uses and Misuses of Accreditation." In Understanding Accreditation: Contemporary Perspectives on Issues and Practices in Evaluating Quality. Edited by Kenneth E. Young and Associates, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bender, L. W., Simmons, H. L., and Myers, Carmen L. 1986. Involvment and Empowerment of Minorities and Women in the Accrediting Process. A paper presented at the 1986 AERA National Conference, San Francisco: ED 267-698

Brass, Daniel J. 1984. "Being in the Right Place: A Structural Analysis of Individual Influence in an Organization." Administrative Science Quarterly : 29. pp. 518-539.

---. June, 1985. "Men and Women's Networks: A Study of Interactive Patters and Influences in an Organization." Academy of Management Journal Vol. 28, No. 2 pp. 327-342.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. 1973. Opportunities for Women in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. 1975. Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. 1984. Bibliography on Postsecondary Accreditation. One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C.

"Criteria and Procedures for Recognition of Nationally Accrediting Agencies and Associations". 1981. Eligibility and Agency Evaluation Office. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, D.C.

Daniel, Walter C. 1985. "The Role and Meaningful Involvement of Minorities in Higher Education Accreditation." Unpublished paper delivered at the 1985 Annual Meeting of the Commission on Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and School in Chicago. 3 pp.

Devadoss, Mudiappasamy and Muth, Rodney. 1984. "Power, Involvement, and Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education." Higher Education. Vol. 13. Amsterdam; Elsener Science Publishers, B.V., pp. 379-391.

Fant, O., Cohan, A., & Kanter, R. 1980. Tale of "O" on Being Different: A Training Tool for Managing Diversity. Unpublished manuscript. Available from 6 Channing Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Fombrun, C. J. 1983. "Attributions of Power Across a Social Network." Human Relations Vol. 36. pp. 493-508.

Francis, D. and Mensel, F. R. Fall, 1981. "Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions: Employment Patters and Salary Comparisons 1978-79 and an Analysis of Progress Toward Affirmative Action Goals, 1975-76 to 1978-79." Journal of College and University Personnel Administrators. 32. pp. 1-17.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. 1983. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, New York Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Holt, M. 1981. "Strategies for the Ascent of Women in Higher Education Administration in the 80's". Journal of National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors. 44(3). pp. 21-24.

Ikenberry, Stanley O. December 15, 1985. "Minority Participation in Higher Education" Black Issues in Higher Education. Vol. 2, No. 12. Fairfax: Virginia. Cox Matthews & Associates, Inc. p. 24.

Kanter, R. M. 1975. "Women and the Structure of Organizations: Explorations in Theory and Behavior." In Another Voice. M. Millman and R. M. Kater (Eds.). Anchor. Garden City: New York.

---. 1977. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.

---. 1979. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." Current Issues in Higher Education 1979. American Association for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.

---. 1979. "Powerfailure in Management Circuits." Harvard Business Review Vol. 57, No. 4. pp. 65-75.

---. 1981. "Career Growth and Organization Power: Issues for Educational Management in the 1980s." Teachers College Record Vol. 82, No. 4. pp. 553-566.

Kells, H.R. (March/April 1979). "The People of Accreditation: A Study of the Characteristics of Evaluation Teams and Related Aspects of the Accrediting Process." Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 50, pp 178-198.

Klein, Susan S. and Bogart, Karen. 1986. "Implications for Increasing Sex Equity at all Educational Levels." Educational Researcher. Vol. 15 No 6.

Kram, K. E. 1980. "Mentoring Processes at Work: Developing Relationships in Managerial Careers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New Haven: Yale University.

Kram, K. and Isabella, L. 1985. "Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development." Academy of Management Journal Vol. 28, No. 1. pp. 110-132.

Moore, K. M. 1984. "Careers in College and University Administration: How Are Women Affected?" In Women in Higher Education Administration. Tinsley, A., Secor, C., & Kaplan, S. eds. pp. 5-15. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Pennsylvania State University and the American Council on Education. 1981. "Leaders in Transition: A National Study of Higher Education Administrators." University Park: Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. Power in Organizations. Boston: Pittman.

Proefreidt, William. Summer, 1985. "Power, Pluralism and the Teaching of Values: The Educational Marketplace." Teachers College Record Vol. 86, No. 4.

Reed, Rodney J. 1983. "Affirmative Action in Higher Education: Is it Necessary?" The Journal of Negro Education Vol. 52, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Howard University. pp. 332-349.

Salancik, Gerald R. and Jeffrey Pfeffer. 1974. "The Bases and Uses of Power in Organizational Decision-Making: The Case of a University." Administrative Science Quarterly Vol. 19, pp. 453-473.

---. 1977. "Who Gets Power and How They Hold On to it: A Strategic Contingency Model of Power." Organizational Dynamics :5. pp. 3-21.

Sheehy, G. 1976. Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life. New York. Bantam Books.

Silvers, Philip J. 1982. "An Assessment of Evaluation Teams in Regional Accreditation of Baccalaureate - Granting Institutions." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Tuscon: University of Arizona. 182 pp.

Simmons, Howard L. 1981. "Implications of Accreditation for Promoting Access, Choice and Parity for Blacks in Higher Education and the Uniqueness of Historically Black Colleges." A Paper presented at NAFEO Conference held in Washington ED 239 533; HE 016 942.

---. 1984. "Minority Involvement in the Accrediting Process." A Paper presented to the Council of Black American Affairs, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in Philadelphia. ED 243 369; HE 017 175.

Tjosvold, Dean. November, 1984. "Cooperative Theory and Organizations." Human Relations Vol. 37. pp. 743-767.

---. 1985. "Power and Social Context in Superior Subordinate Interaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. Vol. 35. pp. 281-293.

The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-3021

College of Education
State and Regional Higher
Education Center
Louis W. Bender, Director
(904) 644-4704

Complimentary copies of all publications are sent to State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges, University Libraries, National Organizations, and the ERIC Clearinghouse. Individual copies may be ordered. A charge of $5.00 for each monograph ordered is necessary to cover printing and mailing costs. Checks should be made out to FSU State and Regional Higher Education Center.

Department of Educational Leadership
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION